# 1 2

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

#### FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

4

5

3

ANDREW ST. LEDGER MONAGHAN, III,

No. C 11-3278 CW

Plaintiff,

6 7

8

10

11

1213

1415

16 17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

18

v.

LARRY P FIDDLER, ALLEN JACKSON, and RICKY KYLE,

Defendants.

ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFF'S
APPLICATION TO
PROCEED IN FORMA
PAUPERIS AND
DISMISSING
COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Andrew St. Ledger Monaghan, III, files an application for leave to proceed <u>in forma pauperis</u> (IFP). The matter was decided on the papers. Having considered all of the papers filed by Plaintiff, the Court GRANTS the application to proceed IFP and dismisses the complaint.

#### DISCUSSION

A court may authorize a plaintiff to prosecute an action in federal court without prepayment of fees or security if the plaintiff submits an affidavit showing that he or she is unable to pay such fees or provide such security. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). Plaintiff has submitted the required documentation, and it is evident from his application that his assets and income are insufficient to enable him to prosecute the action. Accordingly, his application to proceed without the payment of the filing fee is GRANTED.

however, does not mean that he may continue to prosecute his complaint. A court is under a continuing duty to dismiss a case filed without the payment of the filing fee whenever it determines that the action "(i) is frivolous or malicious; (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted; or (iii) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(iii). Because a dismissal pursuant to § 1915(e)(2)(B) is not a dismissal on the merits, but rather an exercise of the court's discretion under the IFP statute, the dismissal does not prejudice the filing of a paid complaint making the same allegations. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 32 (1992). Plaintiff alleges that he was a witness to a murder in Sherman

The Court's grant of Plaintiff's application to proceed IFP,

Plaintiff alleges that he was a witness to a murder in Sherman Oaks, California, that the wrong person was charged with the crime, and that he was not allowed to testify at the trial to exonerate the defendant, who was wrongly convicted. The trial took place in Los Angeles, California. Sherman Oaks and Los Angeles are located in the Central District of California.

Plaintiff sues the trial court judge, a sheriff's officer and the prosecutor for having him improperly removed from the courtroom. Plaintiff also indicates that he brought the same case against the same Defendants in the United States District Court for the Central District of California, case number C 09-5698 DOC-E, which was dismissed without prejudice on January 25, 2010. On February 19, 2010, Plaintiff filed an appeal in the Ninth Circuit, which was dismissed for failure to prosecute on April 14, 2010. Plaintiff also filed a case against Defendants in the Eastern

### Case 4:11-cv-03278-CW Document 12 Filed 10/19/11 Page 3 of 4

2

1

3 4 5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff may not keep filing the same lawsuit against the same Defendants in different venues. Therefore, this case is dismissed as duplicative of the previous cases Plaintiff filed. Furthermore, because the events which gave rise to this action and

District of Pennsylvania, case number 10-cv-2834-JF. He apparently

the parties involved reside in the Central District of California, venue is improper in the Northern District. See 28 U.S.C.

§ 1391(b).

Therefore this complaint is dismissed.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Plaintiff's application to proceed IFP is GRANTED and his complaint is DISMISSED without prejudice to re-filing in federal court with the full filing fee.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

voluntarily dismissed that case.

Dated: 10/19/2011

United States District Judge

26

27

28

1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3 4 5	MONAGHAN et al,  Case Number: CV11-03278 CW  Plaintiff,  CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE  v.
6 7 8	FIDDLER et al,  Defendant.
9 10	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.
11 12 13	That on October 19, 2011, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li><li>16</li></ul>	Andrew St. Ledger Monaghan 503 Olympic Boulevard Santa Monica, CA 90401
17 18 19	Dated: October 19, 2011  Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Nikki Riley, Deputy Clerk
20 21	
<ul><li>21</li><li>22</li><li>23</li></ul>	
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	